

## MINUTES

### CITY PLAN COMMISSION/ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD

NOVEMBER 21, 2016

The City Plan Commission/Architectural Review Board of the City of Clayton, Missouri, met upon the above date at 5:30 p.m. Upon roll call, the following responded:

Present:

Chairman Steve Lichtenfeld  
Joanne M. Boulton, Aldermanic Representative  
Craig Owens, City Manager  
Ron Reim  
Josh Corson  
William Liebermann  
Scott Wilson

Absent:

None

Also in Attendance:

Kevin O'Keefe, City Attorney  
Susan M. Istenes, AICP, Planning Director

Chairman Steve Lichtenfeld welcomed everyone to the meeting. He then asked that all cell phones be turned off and that conversations take place outside the meeting room. He announced that the 8025 Bonhomme (Clayton on the Park) project has been postponed until the next meeting.

## MINUTES

The minutes of the November 7, 2016 meeting was presented for approval. The minutes were approved after having been previously forwarded to each member.

### ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW – FRONT YARD FENCE – 168 NORTH CENTRAL AVENUE

Kent and Jeannine Kalkwarf, property owners, were in attendance at the meeting.

Director Istenes explained that this is a request to allow the replacement of an existing 6-foot high wood (painted black) privacy fence along the eastern and northern property lines with a new 8-foot high cedar fence; the top 2-feet of which is proposed to be wood lattice. The existing fence along the northern property line (fronting Pershing Avenue) is set back 7 feet from the public sidewalk

and is approximately 15 feet long. It is located between the eastern property line and the eastern edge of the driveway. To allow more yard area, the owners are proposing to install the new fence 4 feet closer to the sidewalk, leaving a 3-foot wide planting bed between the fence and the public sidewalk. The existing landscaping in front of the fence will be removed and new shrubs, possibly narrow leaf buckthorns (slow growing, deciduous, 10-12 feet tall at maturity and 6-10 feet wide at maturity) and/or dwarf slender deutzia (deciduous, 2-4 feet tall at maturity), will be planted in front of the fence to soften its appearance. The owners plan to paint the new fence black once it has properly cured. Section 405.1900 of the Zoning Regulations requires that all fences located in the front yard in single-family zoning districts be approved by the Architectural Review Board prior to installation. Historically, the Architectural Review Board has considered requests for front yard fences that are not in conformance with the zoning requirements. For example, on corner lots, 6-foot fences have been approved on “secondary” front yards (what functionally would be a property’s side yard) provided the fence is ornamental or decorative (not a solid wood, chain or vinyl fence) and is placed on the property in a manner which provides a sufficient area for landscaping to break up the monotonous appearance of the fence. Director Istenes noted that the proposed design and materials of the fence are not consistent with the Architectural Review Board’s preference for ornamental or decorative fencing in front yards. Additionally, the new fence will be located 4 foot closer to the sidewalk and is proposed to be constructed to a height of 8 feet, thus making it a very prominent feature along a residential street. With respect to landscaping, the existing shrubs, commonly known as “Firebush,” are located in front of the existing fence. They are mature and have provided a seasonally opaque screen of the wood fence from the sidewalk and street; however, the Firebush, and an existing tree at the northeast corner of the existing fence, will be removed and replaced with plantings that will make the fence immediately visible from the street. Director Istenes stated that staff is of the opinion that the portion of the fence that fronts Pershing Avenue and the fence return to the house should be constructed with materials which are more decorative in nature (metal/iron) and should be limited in height to 6 feet and therefore, recommends approval subject to the following conditions:

1. The portion of the fence fronting Pershing Avenue and the front return to the house shall be limited in height to 6 feet and shall be constructed of a decorative iron or metal to be approved by staff prior to the issuance of a fence permit.
2. The landscape plan for the planting areas along Pershing Avenue and in front of the front return of the fence to the house shall be reviewed and approved by staff prior to the issuance of a fence permit.

Mr. Kalkwarf stated that if they use an iron fence they won’t get the privacy they are looking for.

Chairman Lichtenfeld commented that the Firebush is beautiful and provides a visual screen and it’s a shame to lose them.

Ms. Kalkwarf agreed and added that they want the new fence closer to the sidewalk. She noted that as one looks down Pershing, there are other features close to the sidewalk.

Chairman Lichtenfeld agreed but noted; however, that these other features are low retaining walls.

Mr. Kalkwarf asked for some guidance. He stated that they can plant bushes inside the fence. He asked if they could just have grass on the outside of the fence as they don't want Firebush next to the sidewalk.

Chairman Lichtenfeld stated that he would like to see landscaping to soften the fence's appearance.

A discussion regarding the possible use of monkey grass and/or Liriope ensued, as well as the mention of dogs being walked down this sidewalk.

Joanne Boulton asked staff what is preferred.

Susan Istenes stated that there are times when more substantive landscaping is required. She noted that this is a small area of fencing along the front lessening the impact. She suggested a low growing shrub with a mature height of 6-feet or less.

Chairman Lichtenfeld stated he's okay with Liriope outside the fence, but that he fears that dense landscaping inside the fence will negate the extra 4-feet of yard space the owners are trying to achieve. He noted that the City wants a more ornamental appearance while the owners want privacy. He suggested working with a landscaper and to provide staff with the details.

Hearing no further questions or comments, Craig Owens made a motion to approve per staff recommendations. The motion was seconded by Josh Corson and unanimously approved by the Board.

#### ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW – FRONT YARD FENCE – 7640 MARYLAND AVENUE

Sarah Hartz, owner, was in attendance at the meeting.

Susan Istenes explained that the 6,909-square-foot site is located on the southeast corner of North Hanley Road and Maryland Avenue. She stated that this is a request to approve a previously installed 6-foot cedar shadow-box fence which replaced an existing 20 feet in length, 6 foot high wooden picket style fence. The new fence is an additional 48 feet in length, for a total length of 68 feet along Hanley Road (the new fence was installed prior to ARB/permit approval). The new fence also surrounds the patio and a portion of the back of the house, similar to the previous fence. The new fence parallels Hanley Road and terminates approximately 18 feet from the Maryland Avenue front property line and 24 feet beyond the front building line of the existing single family structure. The fence is set back approximately one foot from the Hanley Road sidewalk. No landscaping is proposed in front of the fence. The owner does plan to stain the fence brown if it is allowed to remain. Director Istenes noted that historically, the Architectural Review Board has considered requests for front yard fences that are not in conformance with the zoning requirements.

For example, on corner lots, 6-foot fences have been approved on “secondary” front yards (what functionally would be a property’s side yard) provided the fence is ornamental or decorative (not a solid wood, chain or vinyl fence) and is placed on the property in a manner which provides a sufficient area for landscaping to break up the monotonous appearance of the fence. However, there is evidence of similar style of wood fencing along Hanley Road, south of the subject property. Hanley Road is a major arterial road through the City and carries heavy traffic volumes; consequently it can be very noisy and bright from headlights. The subject fence is not consistent with the historically approved 4-foot “ornamental or decorative” fence on a secondary frontage; however, an ornamental or decorative fence would not provide the opacity needed to provide adequate screening of Hanley Road. Additionally, there are a series of mature Pear trees planted approximately 3 feet from the back edge of the sidewalk along the fence line that would have to be removed in order to provide an adequate planting area for a landscape bed in front of the fence. The north end of the fence as it exists has an awkward appearance from the sidewalk and the street because it simply terminates and is not returned to the house. Director Istenes stated that staff is of the opinion that the fence is designed with high quality materials and provided it is stained a darker color, is appropriate given the existing conditions on the property and recommends approval with the following conditions:

1. Install a fence return from the northwest corner of the house to the existing fence and remove the remaining fence northward from the newly established corner.
2. Stain the outside of the fence a dark brown color no later than March 15, 2017.
3. Install Liriope ground cover on the outside of the fence, planted 18-inches on center for the entire length of the fence that is parallel to Hanley Road. Plantings shall be installed no later than April 15, 2017.

Ms. Hartz voiced her concern regarding Hanley Road traffic and her property being a block away from the Centene property. She distributed a rendering of an alternative fencing which ended at the same point but decreased in height as it came to its final end to the north. She indicated that she will plant vines to grow on the fence to soften the appearance.

Chairman Lichtenfeld asked how far away the fence is from the street (Maryland).

Ms. Hartz stated it ends between the two trees; she doesn’t want it to interfere with the stone entry at the corner.

Chairman Lichtenfeld commented that at first, staff’s recommendations seemed reasonable.

Scott Wilson asked why this is different from the fence they just considered at 168 North Central.

Joanne Boulton stated because of this property’s location along Hanley Road, it deserved different consideration.

Scott Wilson commented that it seems inconsistent with the 168 North Central Avenue decision.

Susan Istenes noted that Hanley Road is an arterial road and carries a very high volume of traffic and 168 North Central's side road is Pershing which is a residential street with relatively low traffic volume.

Joanne Boulton told the owner that she understands their desire for protection from Hanley Road.

Ron Reim indicated that some soil preparation may be needed.

William Lieberman asked if there are Trustees.

Ms. Hartz replied "no".

Joanne Boulton commented that there was a fence there before.

Ms. Hartz indicated that some fencing was there already. She added that she installed the new fencing before realizing she had to come here for approval.

Ron Reim stated that he, too, understands the reason why the fence is desired.

Chairman Lichtenfeld stated that the alternative seems to be a good one.

Joanne Boulton asked if she would still color the fence.

Ms. Hartz replied "yes".

Ellen Hartz (owner's mother) asked for guidance as to what color to use.

Chairman Lichtenfeld stated that a medium-dark brown would be good. He recommended bringing in a color sample to staff for approval.

Ms. Hartz asked if the color shown on the alternative is a good color.

Chairman Lichtenfeld and Ron Reim indicated that they would prefer a little lighter brown.

Hearing no further questions or comments from either the members or audience, Ron Reim made a motion to approve the alternate design to be in the same location as existing fence (alternate design as distributed at meeting) per staff recommendations 2 and 3 and that the stain color and landscaping be approved by staff prior to implementation. The motion was seconded by Scott Wilson and unanimously approved by the members.

## ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW – FRONT YARD RETAINING WALL – 80 ABERDEEN

Richard Hente, contractor, was in attendance at the meeting.

Susan Istenes explained that the 8,480-square-foot lot is located on the south side of Aberdeen Place; just east of University Lane (second lot east of the intersection). The property has a zoning designation of R-2 Single Family Dwelling District. The proposed project consists of the construction of a 2-foot tall retaining wall within the front yard area parallel to the sidewalk. Section 405.1900 of the City of Clayton Land Use Code requires that all front yard retaining walls in single-family zoning districts be approved by the Architectural Review Board prior to installation. The wall being proposed is constructed of Mosaic by Versa-lok in a natural color installed parallel to the sidewalk along Aberdeen and will run approximately 23-feet on each side of the front walkway and will turn the corners to be adjacent to the first three front steps before it terminates. Additionally, approximately two feet of wall will turn the corners on the east and west property lines. The property is currently undergoing extensive landscaping. Director Istenes noted that the location, height and materials of the proposed wall are consistent with other approved front yard walls and that the Mosaic system, although a man-made material, consists of varying colors, varying block sizes and tumbled edges; features required for walls visible from rights-of-way. Although the property is undergoing extensive landscaping, the addition of a landscaped green area between the wall and the sidewalk would help soften the appearance of two hard surfaces (the wall and the sidewalk) which will be adjacent to one another under the proposed plan. Director Istenes stated that staff recommends approval with the condition that the wall be set back at least three (3) feet from the back of the sidewalk in order to create a landscaped planting bed; the design and plantings of which are to be approved by the staff prior to the issuance of a building permit.

Mr. Hente stated that the Mosaic system forces 10-inch segments; 6-inch & 4-inch. He noted that the sidewalk slopes and that this charcoal/gray blend is not a tall wall and the ends go into the ground.

Chairman Lichtenfeld asked the result of pushing it 3-feet further back onto the property.

Mr. Hente indicated that the owner would lose yard space and with this product, it's impossible; he would have to go with a 4-inch stone. He stated he would also be concerned with water drainage.

Scott Wilson stated that there are other walls that were built up to the sidewalk.

Joanne Boulton stated that the wall on the adjacent property is set back and it's beautiful.

Mr. Hente stated that he's seen that wall; it is made of natural stone. He agreed that there are some in the neighborhood that were built up to the sidewalk.

Chairman Lichtenfeld stated that this Board needs to consider what will look best and that staff's recommendation would result in this wall not sticking out further than the adjoining neighbor's wall.

Ron Reim agreed.

Mr. Hente informed the members that the homeowner doesn't want the wall set back.

Chairman Lichtenfeld stated that the City typically wants walls set back and that it will look better if it is set back.

Mr. Hente indicated he originally had proposed a standard versa-lok wall and had not received a reply from the City for 2 months. He stated that he knows what looks good and this wall looks good.

Chairman Lichtenfeld stated that he agrees that the wall looks good and that it looks natural, but that the appearance with the wall to the west won't be uniform and that he believes staff's recommendation is the way to go.

Scott Wilson agreed.

Joanne Boulton stated that if this is denied, the same application can't come back for a year; however, the applicant can ask for a continuance.

William Lieberman asked if this Board can give staff the discretion.

Chairman Lichtenfeld replied "yes". He added that the Mosaic system is better as it is a varying size system giving a better appearance.

Scott Wilson asked if there's a better stone that could be used further back on the property.

Joanne Boulton stated that there should be a stone material that can go back 3-feet and look nice; having varying sizes, colors and tumbled edges as the City wants.

Me. Hente stated he could go with a natural stone.

Ron Reim asked the relationship between this wall and the neighbor's wall.

Mr. Hente indicated that there's no connection.

Hearing no further questions or comments, Ron Reim made a motion to approve per staff recommendation and that a change in material be approved by staff prior to installation. The motion was seconded by Joanne Boulton and unanimously approved by the Board.

## ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW - FRONT YARD RAILING – 26 RIDGEMOOR

Ms. Lynn Kipnis, owner, was in attendance at the meeting.

Susan Istenes explained that the +/-12,540-square-foot lot is located mid-block on the east side of Ridgemoor Drive in the Claverach Park Subdivision. The proposed project consists of the construction of 60 feet of 34-inch to 38-inch tall hand-railing in the front yard, adjacent to an existing front walkway. The railing will be constructed with two runs of 1 inch x ½ inch channel iron spaced 4 inches apart with ½ inch square bar vertical pickets spaced approximately every 8 and ½ inches with a half ring (8 inches in diameter) welded between the channels and pickets. The top channel will be capped with a 1 and ¾ -inch wide molded cap rail and 1 and ½ inch x 1 1/2 square tubing posts with welded on cast iron collars. The railing will be primed with red oxide and finished in a bronze color. The railing will provide a measure of safety as one uses the walkway, which is stepped. The railing will be installed to follow the curve of the steps. Subdivision Trustee approval has not been submitted. Section 405.1900 of the Zoning Regulations requires that all fences located in the front yard in single-family zoning districts be approved by the Architectural Review Board prior to installation. Director Istenes noted that due to existing site elevations in this area, there are several properties in this neighborhood that are developed with concrete walkways and steps leading across the front yard from the sidewalk to the front door. Under the City's adopted building code, hand rails or a railing is not necessary for these walkway/steps due to the limited number of risers and the separation distance between the risers; however, because the railing is going to be a prominent feature in the front yard, not unlike a fence, staff felt that Architectural Review Board consideration was necessary. Staff is not aware of any handrails of a similar length in the front yard, although a nearby property has several 4 foot long metal decorative handrails along their front yard steps, made of similar materials and color. The railing is minimal in design with decorative elements located below the top rail and on the pickets. Although a prominent feature across the front yard, the materials of the proposed railing are of high quality and the color is neutral, therefore staff feels the visual impact is minimized by its design and recommends approval as submitted.

A material/color sample was distributed. Ms. Kipnis informed the members that the railing will follow the curve of the aggregate walkway and because of the color of the railing, it won't be that visible.

Chairman Lichtenfeld stated that it is a good color.

Scott Wilson asked if this is being proposed for a safety reason.

Ms. Kipnis replied "yes".

Joanne Boulton commented that it's a handsome railing.



Ms. Kipnis informed the members that the Trustees have approved it.

Hearing no further questions or comments, Joanne Boulton made a motion to approve as submitted. The motion was seconded by Ron Reim and unanimously approved by the Board.

#### CITY BUSINESS – DRIVEWAY MATERIAL

Director Istenes indicated that she has not prepared a report for this discussion; however, she is working with the City's contracted architect (H3 Studio) on preparing an update to the ARB Guidelines. She reminded them that the City is lacking a Planner. She then informed the members that Centene's proposed amendment to the Special Development Plan and the proposals for both Sub-district 1 and Sub-district 2a will be presented at the next meeting (December 5<sup>th</sup>).

Having no further business before this Commission this evening, the meeting adjourned at 6:35 p.m.

---

Recording Secretary